

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

September 15, 2003

Ken Lee Building Conference Room
430 "F" Street

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER by Chair Teresa Thomas at 6:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL/MOTION TO EXCUSE

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Teresa Thomas, Vice-Chair Doug Reid, Commissioners Stanley Jasek, John Chávez, Pamela Bensoussan and Juan Diaz

STAFF PRESENT: Marilyn Ponseggi, Environmental Review Coordinator
Paul Hellman, Environmental Projects Manager
Benjamin Guerrero, Environmental Projects Manager
Maria Muett, Associate Planner
Miguel Tapia, Principal Community Development Specialist
Alex Al-agma, Deputy Director of Engineering
Linda Bond, Recording Secretary

GUESTS PRESENT: Phil Martin, Phil Martin & Associates
John Hansell, WP²DC
Larry Lipp, Kimco Realty Corporation
Joseph F. Dameron, JFD Architect
Chris Dameron, JFD Architect
V. Todd Bartok, CostCo Wholesale, Inc.
David Gottfredson, RECON Environmental, Inc.
Rev. Mario Vesga, Our Lady of Guadalupe Church

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: August 4, 2003

MSC (Reid/Jasek) to approve the minutes of August 4, 2003 as submitted. **Vote:** (6-0-0)

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None.

NEW BUSINESS

1. EIR-04-01 – Redevelopment Plan Amendment (Bayfront/Town Centre I Redevelopment Plan Merged Chula Vista Redevelopment Plan)

Ms. Marilyn Ponseggi (*Environmental Review Coordinator*) explained that the structure of the Community Development Department has changed. The environmental process has come back into the Planning & Building Department. There has been a lot of discussion about the environmental process and the need for consistency.

Chair Thomas indicated that the RCC had expressed concern at one time that items that were under Community Development were not going through the same type of CEQA process as the other projects in new development. Ms. Pongseggi stated that concern had been raised at the RCC and other places. The two departments are working much closer than they have in the past. She further stated that having the environmental process all done by one department will help with consistency.

Mr. Miguel Tapia (*Principal Community Development Specialist*) gave a PowerPoint presentation describing the five existing redevelopment project areas:

- Otay Valley
- Southwest Redevelopment Area
- Bayfront
- Town Centre 1
- Town Centre 2

Mr. Tapia indicated that the EIR before the Commissioners was for an amendment to consolidate the five redevelopment plans that already exist into two:

- Bayfront and Town Centre 1 Redevelopment Plan
- Merged Redevelopment Plan – Town Centre 2, Otay Valley and Southwest

Mr. Tapia stated that the third part of the amendment was to extend eminent domain authority with the Otay Valley and Town Centre 2 areas for a period of 12 years. Eminent domain was previously granted to this area, but it will expire shortly. The last part of the amendment consists of adding approximately 550 acres of property into the redevelopment area. These properties are along the Third Avenue corridor, the northern part of the City, Broadway, 'E' Street, 'H' Street and other properties throughout the western part of the City. Most, but not all, of the properties being included are commercial or industrial uses.

Mr. Benjamin Guerrero (*Environmental Projects Manager*) stated that a Program EIR is a first-tier document; a very general document that analyses environmental effects of the program. Subsequent activities that come about within these project areas will require additional environmental review. Mr. Guerrero presented an overview of the Program EIR.

- Advantages of a Program EIR
- Issues addressed
- Significant impacts identified
- Mitigation measures

Commission Comments*

Chair Thomas stated that the City does not have a specific standard for noise. How was the noise mitigated? Ms. Pongseggi indicated that the standards are in the Zoning Code. With this particular document, there is not a project-specific to look at for specific noise impacts. Mr. Guerrero stated that, even though there is not a specific project, there is framework for analyzing noise impacts.

* Response to Commission comments can be found in the "Response to Comments" section of Final EIR-04-01.

Vice-Chair Reid stated that, in the Otay Ranch Program EIR relative to traffic noise, was that, on certain segments of streets, a distance from the centerline in that street was established as a zone where further studies would be required. That was based on the traffic projections from the project and surrounding land uses. He did not see that in this document.

Chair Thomas asked if that were something he would recommend is put in?

Vice-Chair Reid responded in the affirmative. That would give future developers some idea of what further documentation would be required to prepare. Ms. Pongsegi suggested that could be made part of the motion.

Vice-Chair Reid: On page 30, first paragraph under Environmental Setting..."The City of Chula Vista comprises approximately 44,000+ acres of land..." Farther down..."Within the City's jurisdiction, approximately 33,000 acres..." Should that first part be the planning area for the City; the General Plan boundary areas? That should be clarified...the City of Chula Vista planning area or sphere of influence or whatever.

Vice-Chair Reid: On page 57, down at the bottom..."Level of significance before mitigation...be no increase in densities with adoption of amendments". Earlier it was noted that 12-story condos on 'H' Street... That would seem like an increase in density.

Commissioner Bensoussan: How does it fit, is the question. What is the implication of it being sited?

Chair Thomas: The whole City is working on the General Plan Update right now. So, you are talking in terms of 12 stories. That is still not definite.

Commissioner Jasek: The way I read that paragraph was, it simply stated that, this amendment doesn't change any land use designation; therefore, this amendment doesn't increase density. So, those 12-story condos are allowed there based on the current land use designation, and that the amendment doesn't change that.

Chair Thomas: Let me make it clear what I'm trying to say. I understand that you're conforming with the current General Plan. This is ~~It's~~ not in conflict. What I'm saying is, this City has been working on a proposal for a new General Plan Update. This project is not going to occur overnight. It's going to be a part of the new General Plan Update. If this new General Plan Update is in the planning and the impact is going to ~~places~~ say no 12-story building in certain locations, are we doing some injustice by going...potential conflicts with that plan as far as the overview of that plan by having something like this approved at this point in time?

Vice-Chair Reid: That paragraph starts out with the... We are back on page 57. The General Plan would not divorce the General Plan because it is incorporated by reference. And the General Plan designates that area...it looks like, professional administrative.

Chair Thomas: It is a concern because as a City, as a community and your staff time and the people in this room have really spent a lot of time trying to synthesis and plan all aspects that will, you know, will be in a greenhouse, something that could potential conflict with both kinds of things from traffic centers to other things that might cause a big problem. I think you just need to clarify better for us.

Commissioner Bensoussan: Miguel, this is a Redevelopment Plan Amendment. That implies that it's an amendment to a pre-existing plan. And is that pre-existing plan incorporated into this document or is there another document that we should be looking at?

Commissioner Bensoussan: Right, but I just meant in reference to the amendment that we are looking at. I mean is there a part of that plan that relates to this? Are we handicapped because it's not here?

Commissioner Bensoussan: Would I understand correctly that this document with these potential impacts and mitigation guidelines, we would be looking at this document if these plans weren't being merged. We would still have a document like this. It would be referencing the typical plans that weren't merged.

Chair Thomas: In the past we had these little pieces of Chula Vista that were a part of redevelopment, including Montgomery. That little piece near Second Avenue and Palomar, etc., that had its own little proposal.

Vice-Chair Reid: One thing that Miguel pointed out was the area east of the KOA, which is designated on the General Plan as agriculture. I'm not sure what the zoning is. Mr. Tapia did not know what the zoning was for that. It would have to be consistent with the General Plan.

Vice-Chair Reid asked if the City owned any of that. Mr. Tapia indicated that the City owns approximately 14 acres in that area.

Vice-Chair Reid: On page 134 at the very top indicates remaining landfill capacity of the Otay Landfill of 25,800 cubic yards. It seems a bit low. Could you double check that and make sure?

Vice-Chair Reid: On page 170 where it talks about the historical survey of 1985. It includes 61 homes. That is incorrect.

Commissioner Bensoussan: That number is completely off the wall. The historic survey has a couple hundred.

Vice-Chair Reid had some minor typos that he would give to Mr. Guerrero.

Commissioner Jasek: Back in that noise section, the way I understand your explanation of what was said is that if a noise sensitive area is identified, the City sends out a notice. And it is up to that noise sensitive individual to request such a consideration?

Commissioner Jasek: The sensitive entity has to request something out of the ordinary in order to go below what the set standards are now. I just want to bring up the example of the Third and 'H' Gateway Complex within 500 feet of six classrooms of kids and the amount of noise that was ongoing for the extended period of time between next to impossible to teach. And yet the guidelines that we're seeing...for a document that is primarily concerned with commercial areas, and the strict construction to the daytime period (7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.). In the case of Third and 'H', that was the most burdensome period of time for that noise for those kids for over a year! And the building was identified, hopefully, as sensitive built over 50 years ago with no air conditioning so they couldn't even close their windows. All I'm saying is, that maybe we need to make some changes in here to these noise guidelines to

reflect the area where the noise is going to be created so it doesn't become intrusive. Next, I'll talk about my buses.

Commissioner Jasek: Wait a minute. We are way past that. I'm not talking about siting, I'm talking about when they are already situated there. And we build guidelines into a document that says, we can blast holes, we can pile-drive from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. when the kids are in school from 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. instead of saying, we should restrict construction in a site-sensitive area to maybe a different period of time. Common sense tells you that there are other periods of time that would have been less intrusive on the education of those kids.

Commissioner Jasek: Is it within the purview of the City or this document to expand the potential mitigation policy? Most of what's in here is operationally related: vehicles will have mufflers, soil suppression will be used, that type of thing. But often times there are other means of reducing the impact without reducing the noise level. I even brought it to the attention of the developer on Third and 'H' that it would have been tremendously helpful if they would of made a tax deductible donation to beef up the electrical circuit and put one lousy little air conditioner in six classrooms so they could close their windows. Would that type of a mitigation idea be something that could be presented to the developer in the signing stage?

Commissioner Jasek: Could not a mitigation requirement be that the developer do whatever possible to minimize the decibel level within the confines of a building?

Commissioner Bensoussan: I'm kind of alarmed by page 27 of the mitigation measure under Historical Resources at the bottom of the page. It says, "If a project would impact a historical resource, the City or Agency, as appropriate, shall require the project developer to preserve or photo document the resource before its demolition...." That's it? I mean, he doesn't really have to preserve, all he has to do is take a picture of it?

Commissioner Bensoussan: I would just think that one could beef up this paragraph to allow for these other options that you just said. When is this supposed to be dependent on this document?

Commissioner Bensoussan: Okay, going further with that, on page 96 where it talks about scenic roadways. 'F' Street is identified as a scenic roadway, and, indeed, it has a lot of significance historically as the railroad tracks are still there on the western most portion of it. It was a major thoroughfare in the beginning of the century. I'm just wondering why 'F' Street on the map... 'H' Street and 'E' Street go all the way to the bay front as added territories, and 'F' Street stops a little past Broadway. I've heard a lot of talk about the possibility of extending 'F' Street to the bay front. Was this not considered to put that section of 'F' Street from Broadway to the bay front as an added territory?

Commissioner Bensoussan: Wouldn't it make sense to include that because, for example, there has been some talk about having that 'F' Street corridor from linking Third Avenue to the bay front without interfering with the freeway on and off of 'E' Street and 'H' Street, but being able to improve that 'F' Street corridor.

Commissioner Bensoussan: West of Broadway on 'F' Street there is new development?

Commissioner Jasek: So, why would you not include that area she is talking about, but you would hatch-mark the vacant land adjacent to the KOA?

Commissioner Bensoussan: Specifically since 'F' Street is a scenic highway.

Commissioner Jasek: Exactly. You just said that vacant land doesn't lend itself to this project program, but the land we are talking about is not vacant.

Vice-Chair Reid: Figure 17, existing redevelopment area roadways, shows 'F' Street extending almost to the bay.

Commissioner Bensoussan: Okay, I just didn't want this document to get in its way. And if it's included in the bay front redevelopment, why isn't it shown?

Commissioner Bensoussan: On page 171...I take real exception with this sentence in paragraph 2: "There are no known historical buildings in the added territory that would be impacted by future development activity. However, there may be buildings that could be candidates as historical buildings that if demolished or remodeled could be impacted." Well, no kidding! If it's demolished, it's going to be impacted. First of all, there are plenty of historical buildings in those areas. To name just a few: the El Primero Hotel on Third Avenue. That is a historic building on the survey you referred to on page 170. There is the salt works, which is even in your photograph #9. I just think that is a very matter-of-fact, general and overstated statement to say that there are no known historical buildings in the added territory because there are plenty of known historical buildings and sites in that.

Commissioner Bensoussan: But over here, they are referring to the historic homes survey as 1985, which is really also incorrect. It's not really an inventory of historic homes; it's an inventory of historic resources, which includes commercial buildings as well as residential buildings. On page 170, you are talking about the survey and then on page 171, it says, if you are referring back to that, it's under the same heading as cultural resources, and you are saying there are no known. So, even what you said isn't good enough because paragraph 2, sentence 1 implies that there aren't any on the survey, which is a gross misstatement.

Commissioner Bensoussan: On page 93 under Aesthetics...historic resources sometimes fall between the cracks in situations like this. We are talking about the Chula Vista Design Manual, the Design Review process. I propose that there could be a situation of adapted review reuse for a site improvement for historic structure. That might be a better alternative to demolition. There just doesn't seem to be any process referred to in here. The only process referred to is Design Review process, which having this past year attended those meetings for historic preservation task force and having the Design Review Commission delegate come to one meeting and then not come to any more and then having another one appointed and that person didn't come. The Design Review Board seems to be completely not at all sensitive to these. In these redevelopment areas, there are a lot of historic resources that need to be looked at, and the way that the Design Review Board does is too narrowly focused on new construction. So, I would say under Aesthetics, the historical environment is part of the aesthetics. Buildings and adapting facades and improvements in manner sensitive to the historic resources should be addressed somewhere under aesthetics. Maybe by making reference to the RCC or something.

Chair Thomas: Actually it's more than aesthetics. I know at Town Hall 2 the people from the southwest, one of their main concerns was the lack of design along Palomar. They would really like to see more of a theme throughout that area.

Commissioner Bensoussan: On page 170 when you are talking about that survey. It ought to be defined as the actual borders of that survey which was a very funny footprint, and it didn't include a lot of areas like the Montgomery area. The City Council has recommended that the Montgomery area be not left out of any future survey. It looks to me like a lot of these areas are in the Montgomery area where there really is ~~now~~ no survey effective right now. All the more reason to rewrite these paragraphs and not make invalid statements.

Ms. Pongeggi: We will include the minutes in the document, and then respond back to the minutes.

Commissioner Chávez: I assume the organizational comments that are in the back have been addressed within the EIR. Is that correct? Mr. Guerrero responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Chávez: There is a natural concern regarding sensitivity, and it helps on the map if schools, parks, libraries, hospitals, playgrounds, things of that nature would be flagged. That gives us a better idea of nearby or adjacent things that could be impacted that we may otherwise miss. I share Stans' concern over what actually happens in real life with these things. The EIRs will say, not anticipate, should not exceed. It cannot make a hard and fast guarantee, but in real life, nothing happens after that. So, if there was a pile driver that was not expected or closer to a school or library or a home or multi-family dwelling, it has some effect. And I think we should consider having some monitoring requirements when there is a potentially significant noise impact. Because otherwise, it's on a complaint basis...and then you're dealing with police officers who go out there with a meter who don't know how to measure sound properly from inside a building, which is relevant. My comment on noise is, in certain cases, we should consider including noise-monitoring requirements for compliance, particularly during construction and particularly near noise sensitive areas.

Commissioner Chávez: What I'm suggesting here is that we make it a requirement. I understand what normally happens. In practice, there are a lot of things happening. There are a lot of activities going on, and in practice sometimes you could have something that has an adverse impact, a significant impact off-site on nearby receptors that go unflagged or otherwise unnoticed within the City. It's not an uncommon practice to require monitoring as a mitigation measure.

Commissioner Chávez: I'm suggesting that you be more specific.

Chair Thomas: I would like to know why a certain part of Palomar and Montgomery is not included in the redevelopment area? I'm most specifically thinking in terms of the sidewalks, gutters or lack of sidewalks, gutters, etc. on Palomar, Fifth Avenue, that whole area. That could very easily be a part of this pool of areas that the City could get involved with bringing up to par. Right now we have an entrance to Chula Vista coming from Palomar and many, many people come from the south and from the north through the Palomar entrance. The children that are going to school, the people that are using the area have to walk on the street in order to get from A to B. That should be a part of the redevelopment plan, including the part of Montgomery on Second north of Palomar, which still does not have sidewalks, etc. Realizing that your usual stance is when they get remodeled, the parties there put in the sidewalks, but if we wait for that, it going to be another 30 or 40 years. And the promise has been for Montgomery that they would get these upgrades about 15-20 years ago when Montgomery voted to be a part of Chula Vista.

Chair Thomas: I really think you need to re-look at it especially if you do have residents who may not be able to afford to put it in themselves. You could have a means for when they sell it gets paid out. The only way it is going to happen is if it's part of the redevelopment and it comes from an agency such as the City. It's unacceptable at this point as far as they way we are trying to get a whole picture from the aesthetics standpoint, but I'm talking about the safety standpoint, the functional standpoint and doing what is right standpoint. It really is a very sad situation. If there is anything you can do about that, I think that should be included as a comment especially for redevelopment, especially for Montgomery and for that southwest area that has been neglected. Another thing, I think as a mitigation for large areas like this, we really need to look at having monitoring sites for air quality. There is definitely an impact, not just from the construction, but from other areas for air quality. We now have very few monitoring stations: one at EastLake High School and one at 'J' Street. We need to have another one that's more in the bay front and another one on the Main Street area, especially in Main Street near where the concrete construction setup is. They really need a monitoring for air quality there and a monitoring for other things. I think that's a response from the public and from other agencies and institutions have to also be expedited. And I would like to see that included as a part of the overall mitigation for this response to things that might be exceeding the standards of best management practice techniques. In some instances with industries, they should use some of the international standards; whichever is the highest standard. The thing that concerns me is that we need to have the data from the monitoring, and it has to be something that is easy to accumulate. It could also help, especially along Main Street, to have monitoring that will pick up on organics. There are ways of getting samples from the air and testing volatile compounds. There are new technologies for picking up certain ones that could be hazardous. I think we as a City, as a community, as a region, need to look at putting those in those kinds of places so we don't have impacts on the students. The recommendation that I'm making is that we have extra monitoring stations. Many of those areas we really should make illegal certain kinds of businesses. For example, in the bay front area, dry cleaning enterprises. It should be illegal to have schools in areas where they are working with painting. I'm not asking specific for this, I'm asking for it generally. One of the big problems that we have in this City that I think we need to address in these kind of documents is to limit trucks and vehicles with dangerous cargos of vats of gases and other chemicals with potential for exposing on impact. We should limit those trucks and vehicles to areas where there is less chance for them to cause harm within the City streets and neighborhoods. The one other thing we need is a better communication system. What we need here is a quick and easy way for our people of all ages in the neighborhood to be the monitors. We don't have enough staff to be the monitors for all of these things. We really need a functioning hotline where somebody could call this hotline saying you better check up on the spill or cement on the road, etc. It's about time that we got that into place. I know that there are designated people in charge of these things, but it's hard to get hold of them. One big concern of many people in this area, and I think as the RCC, we should have a workshop on this is our water, both the potable water and well as the infrastructure for dealing with sewage. Right now, many of our projects on the east part of 805 were approved, and the infrastructure was put into place to a limited extent because we said we would be treating our sewage eventually for potential construction with the South Bay sewage treatment plant. And the pipes are still not in place to take our sewage from there and bring it to the South Bay plant and then take the treated sewage back up to use as reclaimed water. So we have two problems there that you really need to address because it's a part of this whole area. You need to address how you are going to do that. I don't think the water part of the mitigation is adequate the way it's explained in this document. We need to address how you are going to deal with the new infrastructure.

Chair Thomas: That's actually the main thing, but I was talking in terms of the water/sewage problem in general for all projects also need to be addressed.

MSC (Reid/Chávez) that the RCC find the EIR adequate for certification in accordance with CEQA subject to the inclusion of the minutes from the meeting and responses to all RCC comments in the Final EIR. **Vote:** (6-0-0-0)

Chair Thomas and Commissioner Bensoussan requested a copy of the Final EIR.

2. IS-03-004 – Our Lady of Guadalupe Catholic Church Multipurpose Building, 1603 and 1611 Fresno Avenue, 337 Tremont Street and 341 Anita Street

Ms. Maria Muett (*Associate Planner*) reported that the 1.61-acre project site, consisting of the existing Our Lady of Guadalupe Catholic Church facilities and contiguous property owned by the church, is comprised of four parcels. The site of the proposed new multipurpose building is comprised of three parcels totaling 22,484 square feet. The proposed project consists of the demolition of the existing multipurpose building, rectory and garage and the construction of a new 12,051 square-foot multipurpose building. The 50-space parking lot on the church site, directly across the street from the proposed multipurpose building site, will be available for use during activities occurring at the multipurpose building. A total of 74 off-street parking spaces will serve the entire church complex. Potential environmental effects were looked at. There would not be a significant effect because of mitigation measures added to the project. The following mitigation measures shall be included in the Conditional Use Permit: 1) the church and multipurpose facilities shall not be used concurrently; and 2) the occupancy of the multipurpose building shall not exceed 260 persons.

Commission Comments

Commissioner Jasek noted that there were no environmental issues identified by the public during a Community Meeting held on July 21, 2003. He asked if there had been any since that meeting. Mr. Paul Hellman (*Environmental Projects Manager*) responded in the negative.

Commissioner Chávez asked if the City was sure the project had adequate parking spaces. Ms. Muett responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Diaz asked if there had been comments from the neighbors regarding the change in zoning and building height. Ms. Pongsegi responded in the negative.

MSC (Diaz/Reid) that the Initial Study is adequate and the Mitigated Negative Declaration be adopted. **Vote:** (6-0-0-0)

3. IS-03-024 – Broadway Plaza, 1136-1144 Broadway

Vice-Chair Reid recused himself from this item.

Mr. Hellman reported that the Broadway Plaza proposal consists of the redevelopment of an existing shopping center on a 31.5-acre site. Mr. Hellman summarized the Mitigated Negative Declaration document.

Commission Comments

It appeared to Commissioner Chávez that the worst factor for noise was the proposed trash compactor near the temporary school buildings immediately west of the proposed Costco warehouse. He asked if the 8-foot wall would completely enclose the compactor. Mr. Hellman responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Chávez inquired as to what the City's consideration was in regard to noise around playground activity. Mr. David Gottfredson (*RECON, 1927 Fifth Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101*) indicated that the noise standards are regulated by the noise ordinance, which is applied at the property line and considers the adjacent land uses. The ambient level was measured adjacent to the school site both near Naples Street and near the playgrounds and future planned park site.

Commissioner Chávez did not see any comments from the school. Ms. Pongeggi stated that they have been involved in the planning process. Mr. Hellman indicated that they have not expressed any concerns about how the project is designed.

Commissioner Chávez stated that the worst situation would be the demolition and construction activity. He asked that there be some provision made for demolition and construction noise monitoring for the effectiveness of the mitigation near the school buildings. He wanted to be assured that there would not be a disruption of classroom activity. Ms. Pongeggi directed his attention to the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program table in the Mitigated Negative Declaration (Attachment A, Table 1, Noise, Item #2).

Chair Thomas indicated that maybe the major demolition activities could occur while the school is out of session.

Commissioner Bensoussan asked if the East 'H' Street Costco was going to be closed. Mr. V. Todd Bartok (*Costco Wholesale, Inc., 17300 Red Hill Avenue, Suite 230, Irvine, CA 92614*) responded in the negative.

Commissioner Diaz asked how many parking spaces would be provided. Mr. Hellman indicated that a total of 1,782 are proposed for the center.

Commissioner Diaz stated that presently, when you go to the existing Costco gas station on the site, you can exit directly out onto Broadway. He stated that the proposed site plan shows that driveway being blocked, which is a problem since not having that driveway will cause a bottleneck. He also stated that the existing entrance on Oxford Street near the gas station needs to be wider.

MSC (Jasek/Diaz) to accept that the Initial Study is adequate and the Mitigated Negative Declaration be adopted. **Vote:** (5-0-1-0) with Reid abstaining.

MSC (Diaz/Bensoussan) to look at the exit and entrance of the Costco gas station at the corner of Oxford Street and Broadway and not approve the proposal to block it off. **Vote:** (5-0-1-0) with Reid abstaining.

Vice-Chair Reid returned to the meeting.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COORDINATOR COMMENTS: None.**CHAIR COMMENTS**

Chair Thomas requested that a new calendar of RCC and General Plan Update Subcommittee meetings be distributed. Ms. Pongseggi asked Mr. Hellman to update the meeting schedule and send it to the Commissioners via e-mail.

Chair Thomas noted that the Commission still had a vacancy and asked if it should be advertised again. Ms. Pongseggi stated that she had notified the City Clerk's Office and the Mayor's Office.

Chair Thomas stated that the RCC had put together a work plan a couple years ago. She felt it was time to re-look at workshops to focus on things like traffic and policies.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**4. Traffic Workshop Overview**

Ms. Pongseggi asked Commissioner Chávez for a list of the kinds of things he wanted included in the traffic workshop.

Commissioner Chávez stated that his general concern was to get an understanding of the mechanics of traffic measurements as it relates to CEQA levels of significance. For example, the impacts of I-805 going south onto 'L' Street. Ms. Pongseggi suggested that perhaps the RCC should do a workshop on the City's thresholds and the monitoring that is done. Someone from Engineering could discuss how traffic reports are prepared, how traffic modeling is done, the growth management process and the City's traffic study guidelines. She stated that freeways are not within the City's jurisdiction. Ms. Pongseggi stated that she would try to schedule a traffic workshop for November 3, 2003.

Future Absences

Commissioner Chávez:	September 20 thru October 20
Vice-Chair Reid:	October 6
Commissioner Bensoussan:	October 6

Since there would not be a quorum for the regularly scheduled meeting of October 6, 2003, the meeting was adjourned to the regular meeting of October 20, 2003.

ADJOURNMENT: Chair Thomas adjourned the meeting at 8:57 p.m. to a regular meeting on Monday, October 20, 2003, at 6:00 p.m. in the Ken Lee Building Conference Room, 430 "F" Street, Chula Vista, CA 91910.

Prepared by:

Linda Bond
Recording Secretary